

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05744 01 OF 02 221939Z

70

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /089 W

----- 088791

R 221325Z OCT 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4167

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 5744

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJECT: MBFR: PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS: SPC MEETING

OCTOBER 20

REF: STATE 246629 DTG 162353Z OCT 75

1. PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS RETURNED TO SPC AGENDA ON OCTOBER 20 AT FRG AND BELGIAN REQUEST.

2. FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID HE HAD NEW INSTRUCTION ON THIS ISSUE. FRG AGREED WITH BELGIUM THAT THE ALLIES COULD NOT LEAVE THIS QUESTION UNRESOLVED. THIS QUESTION IS OF GREATEST IMPORTANCE, BECAUSE IT COULD OPEN THE WAY FOR EASTERN INTERFERENCE IN NATO DEFENSE PLANNING. THE SUBJECT WILL BE ADDRESSED BY THE OTHER SIDE IN CONNECTION WITH OPTION III. FRG CONSIDERS IT NECESSARY TO RESOLVE THIS QUESTION BEFORE ALLIED INTRODUCTION OF AN OPTION III PROPOSAL. FRG BELIEVES IT POSSIBLE FOR ALLIES TO DEVELOP THEIR POSITION ON PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS WITHOUT DELAYING WORK ON OPTION III.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05744 01 OF 02 221939Z

3. RE THE FRG POSITION, FRG REP SAID THAT BONN CONSIDERS AVOIDANCE OF NATIONAL CEILINGS TO BE THE CENTRAL ASPECT OF THE ALLIED MBFR POSITION. BONN HAS NO DOUBT THAT THE REASON THE EAST RAISED THE ISSUE OF NATIONAL REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS WAS TO

THWART THE ALLIED OBJECTIVE OF AVOIDING NATIONAL SUB-CEILINGS. HE SAID THAT IT WAS INDEED POSSIBLE IN THEORY TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS AND NATIONAL SUB-CEILINGS. HOWEVER, IF EVERY DIRECT PARTICIPANT WERE TO TAKE INDIVIDUAL REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS, THE EAST WOULD CERTAINLY TRY TO DEDUCE THAT THESE INDIVIDUAL REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS IMPOSED NATIONAL CEILINGS. BONN CONSIDERS THAT THE WHOLE CONCEPT OF THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING WOULD BE ENDANGERED BY AGREEING TO NATIONAL REDUCTIONS OBLIGATIONS. FRG REP NOTED THAT PARA 34 OF THE ALLIED NEGOTIATING MANDATE (C-M(75)83) ALREADY PROVIDED THAT REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS SHOULD BE AS COLLECTIVE AS POSSIBLE, IN STATING THAT THE ALLIES WOULD WISH TO BE FREE TO DECIDE AMONG THEMSELVES THE APPORTIONMENT OF PHASE II REDUCTIONS. FRG THUS MAINTAINS THE COLLECTIVE NATURE OF REDUCTION COMMITMENTS.

4. FRG REP SAID THAT THE ALLIES WOULD NOT BE ASKING THE IMPOSSIBLE IN REQUIRING EASTERN AGREEMENT ON THE COLLECTIVE NATURE OF REDUCTION COMMITMENTS. COLLECTIVE REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS WOULD NOT EXCLUDE NATO TELLING THE OTHER SIDE AT THE END OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS HOW THE ALLIED REDUCTIONS WOULD BE APPORTIONED. HOWEVER, THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT ACCEPT ANYTHING WHICH WOULD ENABLE THE OTHER SIDE TO INTERFERE IN ALLIED DEFENSE ARRANGEMENTS. FRG BELIEVED GUIDANCE TO AHG SHOULD CONTAIN THE FOLLOWING SIX ELEMENTS: 1) REFERENCE TO THE CONCEPT OF A COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING; 2) STATEMENT OF THE ALL PARTICIPANTS CLAUSE; 3) THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING WOULD BE ACHIEVED ONLY THROUGH COLLECTIVE REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS; 4) THE ALLIES WOULD TELL THE OTHER SIDE THAT THEY WERE READY, AFTER CONCLUSION OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS, TO TELL THE EAST HOW THEY HAD DECIDED TO APPORTION THEIR REDUCTIONS; 5) THE NOTICE OF APPORTIONMENT DID NOT CONTRADICT THE COLLECTIVE CHARACTER OF THE CEILINGS; AND 6) THE ALLIES WOULD ALSO TELL THE EAST THAT AT THIS JUNCTURE IT WAS NOT APPROPRIATE TO COMMENT FURTHER.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05744 01 OF 02 221939Z

5. UK REP (BAILES ) ASKED IF FRG NOTICE OF APPORTIONMENT WOULD TAKE PLACE BEFORE OR AFTER SIGNATURE OF THE PHASE II AGREEMENT. FRG REP REPLIED THAT IT WOULD BE BETTER NOT TO SAY. (COMMENT: FRG BASIC POSITION IS THUS IDENTICAL WITH THAT DEFENDED BY FRG BEFORE SPC PUT ASIDE WORK ON THIS ISSUE IN JULY.)

6. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) SAID BELGIUM AGREED WITH FRG THAT ALLIES SHOULD DECIDE THE QUESTION OF PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS. BELGIUM AGREES WITH FRG ON THE COLLECTIVE NATURE OF REDUCTION COMMITMENTS, AND THAT EACH SIDE SHOULD NOTIFY THE OTHER OF THE APPORTIONMENT OF ITS REDUCTIONS AFTER THE END OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS. HOWEVER, BELGIUM BELIEVES THIS SHOULD BE DONE BEFORE SIGNATURE, IN ORDER TO GIVE THE OTHER SIDE A CHANCE TO GET USED TO THE ALLIED APPORTIONMENT, AND NOT PUT THE

WHOLE TREATY IN JEOPARDY. HE MADE CLEAR THAT HE DID NOT MEAN BY THIS THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD BE WILLING TO RE-OPEN THE NEGOTIATION IF THE OTHER SIDE DID NOT LIKE THE ALLIED APPORTIONMENT. (COMMENT: THIS REPRESENTS A CHANGE IN BELGIAN POSITION SINCE AT THAT TIME BELGIUM WAS WILLING TO ENGAGE THE OTHER SIDE IN A DISCUSSION OF THE APPORTIONMENT.)

7. US REP (MOORE) STATED THAT HE ALSO HAD INSTRUCTIONS, WHICH RE-CONFIRMED THE EXISTING US VIEW THAT EXISTING NAC GUIDANCE ON THIS QUESTION IS ADEQUATE FOR THE PRESENT, AND THAT THERE WAS NO OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR NEW NAC GUIDANCE AT THIS TIME (REFTEL. HE NOTED THAT THE ALLIES ARE FIRMLY AGREED THAT THERE SHOULD BE NO NATIONAL SUB-CEILINGS. THE ALLIES EMPHASIZE THIS IN THE GUIDANCE ON OPTION III BY CONSTANTLY REFERRING TO THE "COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING," INSTEAD OF SIMPLY THE "COMMON CEILING" AS IN THE PAST. THE ALLIES HAVE FULLY SAFEGUARDED THEIR POSITION ON THIS ISSUE. THE DISTINCTION THE EAST HAS MADE BETWEEN NATIONAL CEILINGS AND NATIONAL REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS IS ANOTHER MATTER. THERE IS NO REASON WHY THE ALLIES SHOULD AT THIS TIME HAVE TO GO BEYOND WHAT THEY HAVE ALREADY SAID TO THE EAST UNDER EXISTING NAC GUIDANCE. NOR IS THERE ANY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ISSUE OF REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS AND OPTION III.

8. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) SAID HE HAD NO NEW INSTRUCTIONS, BUT HE NOTED THAT DUTCH VIEWS IN THE PAST HAVE BEEN ALONG THE LINES JUST EXPRESSED BY THE US REP.

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05744 01 OF 02 221939Z

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 05744 02 OF 02 221943Z

70

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /089 W

----- 088861

R 221325Z OCT 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4168

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 5744

9. COMMENT: WE CONSIDER IT LIKELY THAT AT THE SPC MEETING ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23, NETHERLANDS AND UK WILL RE-STATE THEIR VIEWS THAT IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO DECIDE THE QUESTION OF PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS AT THIS TIME, AND CERTAINLY NOT IN CONNECTION WITH OPTION III. US, UK AND NETHERLANDS AGREEMENT ON THIS ISSUE, AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FRG AND BELGIUM ON WHAT TO TELL THE EAST ABOUT TIMING OF NOTIFICATION, WOULD OF COURSE SERVE THE US OBJECTIVE OF DEFERRING THE DISCUSSION OF THIS ISSUE. END COMMENT.

10. FOR VIENNA: IT IS VIRTUALLY CERTAIN THAT AT AHG BRIEFING OF THE NAC ON FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24, ONE OF THE PREMREPS (PROBABLY DE STAERCKE) WILL ASK THE AHG REP IF THERE IS A NEED FOR EARLY NAC GUIDANCE ON PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS. A POSITIVE RESPONSE FROM AHG REP WOULD MAKE IT MORE DIFFICULT TO DEFER DISCUSSION OF THIS ISSUE UNTIL COMPLETION OF WORK ON OPTION III. WE HOPE AHG GUIDELINES TO AHG REP WILL NOT ENABLE HIM TO CALL FOR EARLY NAC GUIDANCE ON THIS ISSUE. END FOR VIENNA.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05744 02 OF 02 221943Z

11. ACTION REQUESTED: FRG STATEMENT IN PARAS 2-5 ABOVE DESERVES BRIEF INSTRUCTED COMMENT. WE BELIEVE WE DO NOT NEED TO MAKE INSTRUCTED REPLY ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23, SO A BRIEF COMMENT FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 27 WOULD BE TIME ENOUGH. BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 22 OCT 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** greeneet  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO05744  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t197510101/abbrzmro.tel  
**Line Count:** 197  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** STATE 246629 DTG 162353Z OCT 75  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** greeneet  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 15 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <15 APR 2003 by SmithRJ>; APPROVED <17 SEP 2003 by greeneet>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS: SPC MEETING OCTOBER 20  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO, MBFR  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA  
BONN  
LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006